

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 204th Meeting
on Thursday, 7 March 2024 at 2:30 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Prof SO Cheung-tak, Douglas, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof CHAN Ching, Selina
Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai
Ms CHEUNG Tih-lin, Vanessa
Miss CHIM Wing-yi, Erica
Prof CHU Hoi-shan
Mr FU Chin-shing, Ivan, MH, JP
Mr HO Kui-yip, MH, JP
Prof LAM Weng-cheong
Dr LEE Ching-yee, Jane, JP
Prof LI Chi-miu, Phyllis, BBS
Ms SEE Sau-mei, Salome
Mr SU Yau-on, Albert, MH, JP
Mr YAM Ming-ho, Caspar
Miss YEUNG Wing-shan, Theresa
Ms YIP Ka-ming, Alice
Mr YUEN Siu-bun, Edward

Ms Shirley YEUNG (Secretary)
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments) 2
Antiquities and Monuments Office

Absent with Apologies: Mr CHAN Chun-hung, Vincent
Dr IP Chung-man, Tony, MH
Mr SHUM Ho-kit, BBS, JP
Mr TSANG Chiu-tong, Brian
Dr YEUNG Wai-shing, Frankie, BBS, MH, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Miss Pamela LAM, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 1 [DS(W)1]

Mr Ivanhoe CHANG
Commissioner for Heritage [C for H]

Mr Sunny LO
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 [CAS(W)2]

Ms Clarissa WAN
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3

Ms Ella LAM
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation) 1

Antiquities and Monuments Office

Ms Fione LO
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)
[ES(AM)]

Ms Susanna SIU, MH
Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities & Monuments)
[CHE(AM)]

Ms Cecilia SUEN
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 1

Ms Teresa LEUNG
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 2

Ms Teresa LO
Curator (Historical Buildings) 2 [C(HB)2]

Miss Beatrice WONG
Curator (Historical Buildings) 3 [C(HB)3]

Architectural Services Department

Mr Raymond CHAN
Assistant Director (Property Services)

Planning Department

Ms Winnie LAU
Assistant Director of Planning / Metro

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting, in particular, Mr Raymond CHAN, who had taken over from Mr Alan SIN as the Assistant Director (Property Services) of the Architectural Services Department and attended the meeting for the first time. He also thanked Mr Alan SIN for his invaluable advice and support to the Antiquities Advisory Board (the “Board”) all along.

2. The Chairman reminded Members to declare interest when they perceived that there might be conflict of interest in matters being discussed or to be discussed at the meeting.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 203rd Meeting held on 14 December 2023 (Board Minutes AAB/4/2023-24)

3. The minutes of the 203rd meeting held on 14 December 2023 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/24/2023-24)**

4. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of the major heritage conservation projects from 1 November 2023 to 15 February 2024 as detailed in the Board Paper, including major preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings projects. CHE(AM) briefed Members on those regarding archaeological work as well as educational and publicity activities.

5. The Chairman encouraged Members to invite their families and friends to the “Under the Same Roof: Origin and Art of Lingnan Traditional Architecture” exhibition which was being staged at Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, and suggested doing more promotions on the exhibition to attract culture and art lovers from the Mainland and overseas to complement the “Art March 2024” of Hong Kong.
6. Mr Edward YUEN enquired whether any built heritage in Hong Kong would be included in the programmes of the prevailing in-depth tourism in the city.
7. Prof Phyllis LI enquired about the progress of Block 4 of the revitalised Central Police Station Compound (the “CPS Compound”). Besides, she suggested that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) collaborate with the Tourism Commission or Hong Kong Tourism Board (“HKTB”) to enrich “city walk” through the “point-line-plane” approach to link up historic buildings and local characteristics of a place with a view to promoting Hong Kong’s cultural heritage holistically.
8. C for H responded that AMO had been working closely with the Tourism Commission and HKTB on in-depth tourism. The recent programmes and activities organised by the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office (“CHO”) and AMO also sought to cover historic buildings in a wider perspective. For example, the “Heritage Run” held in different districts of Hong Kong linked up built heritage of the respective districts to showcase their history of development and characteristics. The routes of the “Heritage Run” had been published on AMO’s website for easy reference by both locals and visitors. CHO and AMO would continue to work with relevant departments to explore more routes and attractions for in-depth heritage tourism.
9. Regarding the Block 4 of the CPS Compound, CAS(W)2 reported that the Hong Kong Jockey Club (“HKJC”) had been carrying out site investigation to ascertain the structural condition of the brickwork building. HKJC and AMO had also been working together to facilitate the site investigation. It was found that there were serious structural cracks at the key brickwork structures and the bricks were weak. HKJC was in the process of removing the unsafe parts of building fabrics of the Block 4 on a strictly necessary basis from the perspective of public safety. The historic building fabrics would be salvaged and stored by HKJC for possible reuse in future conservation proposal of the Block 4. He understood that HKJC had removed the roof structure and parts of the upper floor of the Block 4. CHO and AMO would continue to work closely with HKJC on the matter to ensure

that all removal works were carried out on a strictly necessary basis for protection of public safety. The Chairman thanked CAS(W)2 for updating the latest development of the Block 4 and wished that further update on the matter could be shared with the Board in due course.

Item 3 Declaration of Two Historic Buildings as Monuments (Board Paper AAB/25/2023-24)

10. The Chairman said that the following two items were proposed for declaration as monuments, and item (ii) was visited by Members on 2 June 2023 during its grading review -

- (i) Lo Pan Temple, No. 15 Ching Lin Terrace, Kennedy Town, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 18); and
- (ii) The Residence of Tang Pak Kau, No. 20 Tsz Tong Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long, New Territories, Grade 1 (Serial No. 612).

He thanked Hong Kong Lo Pan Kwong Yuet Tong (“HKLPKYT”), the management party of the Lo Pan Temple (the “Temple”), and the owners of The Residence of Tang Pak Kau (the “Residence”) for their support for the study and the intended declaration of the two historic buildings respectively.

11. C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage values of the Temple and the Residence.

Lo Pan Temple, No. 15 Ching Lin Terrace, Kennedy Town, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 18)

12. In response to Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai’s enquiry on the ownership of the land where the Temple was located, C(HB)2 replied that the land was owned by five trustees of Kwong Yut Tong according to the Land Register of the Land Registry.

13. Prof Phyllis LI supported the proposed declaration considering that the Temple formed a significant part of Hong Kong’s history. It did not only tell the Chinese settlement in the early days but also served as a place for the Chinese to pay homage to the master of the construction industry.

14. Mr Albert SU supported the proposed declaration considering that the Temple had played an important role in the construction industry in Hong Kong. He added that despite the small size of the Temple, the decorative features with exquisite craftsmanship displayed inside the building were very well-maintained and of high authenticity. Besides, he wished that the Government could support its maintenance as appropriate upon monument declaration.

15. Mr Ivan FU declared that he was a former member of the Construction Industry Council (“CIC”) and currently the Chairperson of the Committee on Environment of CIC. He shared with the meeting that many leaders of the construction industry would gather to pay homage to Lo Pan at the Temple during the “Master Festival”. Moreover, inheriting the spirit of Lo Pan, CIC had launched the “Construction Industry Lo Pan Rice Campaign” during the “Master Festival” since 2020 to distribute “master rice” to the underprivileged groups as the construction industry’s contribution to the community. He opined that the Temple which was built in 1928 was one of the few examples of long-established historic buildings still having such a close connection with the modern society.

16. In response to Prof LAM Weng-cheong’s enquiry on which year the Shiwan ceramics at the ridges of the Temple were placed, C(HB)2 replied that they were dated 1928 as inscribed on one of the ceramics on the main ridge.

17. Ms Alice YIP supported the proposed declaration. She commented that the Temple was beautiful with rich stories associated with the construction industry. She enquired whether the postcards and the stamping set of the Temple as displayed at the meeting room were exclusively made for the Temple, and suggested designing different stamps or digital badges of declared monuments for visitors’ collection as a way of promotion of built heritage.

18. CHE(AM) responded that the postcards and stamping set were made for the “Under the Same Roof: Origin and Art of Lingnan Traditional Architecture” exhibition. Having received positive feedback from the visitors, AMO would continue to design similar ones in the future. Besides, AMO would explore making use of digital badges.

19. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the proposed declaration. He commented that the ceramic figurines and plaster mouldings of the Temple retained their bright colour, and the wood carvings were of long history for almost 100 years. He wished that those decorative features of the Temple could be further preserved in the future, and AMO could conduct three-dimensional (“3D”) scanning to record

the Temple at its present good condition. C(HB)2 responded that AMO would conduct recording of the Temple for future maintenance reference and preservation purposes.

20. The Chairman enquired if the decorative features of the first Temple built in 1884 still remained in the existing Temple built in 1928. In response, C(HB)2 said that the construction of the first Temple began in 1884 and was completed in 1888. Features of the first Temple, such as the stone tablets commemorating the construction and later renovations of the building, had been retained in the existing Temple.

21. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG supported the proposed declaration. Considering the special status of Lo Pan being the patron saint of Chinese builders, she suggested sharing the stories of Lo Pan and the Temple with the construction practitioners and the general public, with a view to improving public perception of the construction industry.

22. Miss Erica CHIM suggested sharing the videos and photos of the Temple and other historic buildings taken by AMO with the public on AAB's website.

23. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether the Temple had its own website, C(HB)2 replied that HKLPKYT had an official website on which a lot of information on the Temple was available. The Chairman hoped that the latest information of the Temple could be shared with the public through multiple channels as it was anticipated that the declaration of the Temple as a monument would attract many visitors to it.

24. The Board supported unanimously the intended declaration of the Temple as a monument under section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53).

The Residence of Tang Pak Kau, No. 20 Tsz Tong Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long, New Territories, Grade 1 (Serial No. 612)

25. Ms Salome SEE supported the proposed declaration. She was very impressed by the good condition of the Residence as noted during the Board's visit. In view of TANG Pak-kau's contribution in reclaiming the iron gate of Kat Hing Wai from the British government, she suggested that information be provided at the Residence to guide visitors to visit the nearby Kat Hing Wai as well. The Chairman echoed, adding that QR code might also be installed at the site of the

Residence to lead visitors to Kat Hing Wai.

26. Prof Phyllis LI commented that the compound of the Residence comprised various land lots as it expanded through time and hence making the building elongated and special. She wished that the windows and doors which had been replaced during alterations as well as other character-defining elements could be reinstated upon monument declaration so that they could be in harmony with the entire compound of the Residence.

27. Mr Edward YUEN asked how members of the public could appreciate the Residence as it was under private ownership. ES(AM) replied that the owner of the Residence supported the intended declaration and was open for further discussion on the arrangement of possible public appreciation of the building. Besides, upon monument declaration, AMO would install an information sign at the site of the Residence. Relevant information would also be uploaded on AMO's website.

28. The Board supported unanimously the intended declaration of the Residence as a monument under section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53).

Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Revitalisation of Fong Yuen Study Hall into Fong Yuen Study Hall – Experiential Learning Center (Board Paper AAB/26/2023-24)

29. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the Boys' Brigade, Hong Kong ("BBHK") and its project and heritage consultants (the "Fong Yuen Study Hall ("FYSH") Project Team") to the meeting to present the heritage impact assessment ("HIA") of the proposed works to convert FYSH, a Grade 3 historic building, into "FYSH – Experiential Learning Center" (the "ELC"), a learning centre with original school function and STEM (i.e. science, technology, engineering and mathematics) elements in activities as well as provision of services to connect the community through exhibitions, experiential workshops and guided tours (the "FYSH Project"), adding that the FYSH Project was one of the projects under Batch VI of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (the "Revitalisation Scheme") under the Development Bureau ("DEVB"):

- (i) Dr LAI Chun-wai, Charles
Architectural Historian, Aona Design Limited
- (ii) Mr LEE Shu-fan
Design Director, Studio Zhai Limited
- (iii) Mr WONG Chun-chin
Brigade Advisor, BBHK

30. Dr Charles LAI introduced to Members the objectives and the site of the FYSH Project, in which FYSH and its gateway were Grade 3 historic buildings. He further elaborated on the historical, architectural and social values of FYSH, and explained the design proposal of the FYSH Project and the possible impacts on FYSH and the proposed mitigation measures.

(Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai and Ms Vanessa CHEUNG left the meeting at 16:00 and 16:06 respectively)

31. Ms Salome SEE shared with Members that she had been to FYSH before. She said that FYSH appeared to be situated remotely with thick vegetation around, making it relatively unknown to the general public. She suggested planning for the provision of signage around the site for ease of navigation by visitors.

32. Mr HO Kui-yip commented that the proposed reconstruction of the external staircase could open up the elevation of the north façade of FYSH, thus making it more visible for appreciation by visitors. The overall arrangement was better than the previous design of FYSH when it was operated as the Tourism and Chinese Cultural Centre cum Ma Wan Residents Museum.

33. Regarding Ms Salome SEE's concerns, Mr WONG Chun-chin responded that BBHK had been operating in Ma Wan since 2009 and had then expanded its service points in the place in 2012 and 2019. The FYSH Project would be another new service point of BBHK in Ma Wan. Besides, apart from using signage, the FYSH Project Team was exploring ways to guide visitors from the drop-off points to the ELC having regard to the new public transport service to the site.

34. Prof Phyllis LI opined that the gradual change of the mode in the provision of education by FYSH, from being a private study hall and a village school in the past into a modern experiential learning centre to-be, was an

important element and should be interpreted in the FYSH Project. In addition, she enquired about the ways to achieve synergy effect and sustainability of the ELC capitalising on the nearby spots such as Ma Wan Park and The Salvation Army – Ma Wan Youth Camp.

35. Dr Charles LAI replied that the evolution of FYSH as well as the history of the Chan Study Hall (forerunner of FYSH) in Tin Liu Village of Ma Wan dating back to the periods from 1902 to 1906 would be studied, together with oral history interview to be conducted, with a view to interpreting the transformation of FYSH in the heritage interpretation area upon opening of the ELC. On the other hand, BBHK had been studying how to connect the ELC with other service points under its management with a view to making them come into play.

36. Miss Theresa YEUNG appreciated the FYSH Project, especially the organisation of guided tours to the ELC and other heritage assets in Ma Wan as this could achieve the “point-line-plane” purpose. However, she expressed concern on the financial sustainability of the ELC as the guided tours might not be profit-making activities.

(Prof CHU Hoi-shan joined the meeting at 16:18)

37. Prof Selina CHAN commented that the sustainability of the ELC should involve the participation of both local residents and people who lived outside Ma Wan.

38. The Chairman supplemented that the FYSH Project of BBHK under the Revitalisation Scheme had been assessed by the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation (“ACBHC”) before, during which the sustainability and revenue aspects of the ELC had been thoroughly discussed.

39. Dr Charles LAI shared with Members that the FYSH Project Team had been collecting views from the local residents as well as conducting oral history interviews with them regarding FYSH. It was noted that many of the interviewees were happy to know about the project and many of the indigenous inhabitants of Tin Liu Village were former students of FYSH. The FYSH Project Team would continue the liaison work with a view to engaging the community in the FYSH Project.

40. Regarding the synergy effect, Mr WONG Chun-chin supplemented that BBHK first provided adventure training activities in Ma Wan in 2009, then

expanded to ecology and liberal learning in 2012 and later woodworking and recreation programmes in 2019. The integration of STEM elements in the FYSH Project would enrich the experience. The FYSH Project Team had been exploring ways to link up these different activities so as to make the visit to the place entertaining for young people. He thanked Members for their concern on the financial sustainability of the ELC and advised that BBHK would implement financial monitoring measures to ensure its stability.

41. Considering that Ma Wan was a notable archaeological site in Hong Kong and archaeology would be a good medium to understand ancient culture and provide hands-on practice which could facilitate STEM education, Prof LAM Weng-cheong suggested injecting archaeological elements (e.g. organising activities relating to the archaeological finds unearthed at Ma Wan) into the interpretation of the historical context of Tin Liu Village at the ELC's heritage interpretation area for reflecting a more comprehensive history of the place.

42. Miss Erica CHIM commented that FYSH reflected the rural history of the past. Besides, given the growing public interest in the preservation of intangible cultural heritage in recent years, she suggested exploring the feasibility of inclusion of other heritage assets of Ma Wan (such as the rituals of the Tin Hau Festival and Yu Lan Festival which were both on the list of the intangible cultural heritage of Hong Kong) in the guided tours of the FYSH Project so as to enrich the routes.

43. Mr Ivan FU remarked that the STEM education had recently shifted to STEAM education.

44. The Chairman thanked Members for their suggestions and asked the FYSH Project Team to take Members' suggestions into account. With no further views from Members, the Chairman concluded that the Board endorsed the HIA report of the FYSH Project and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board regarding the FYSH Project was not required.

**Item 5 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Revitalisation of Homi Villa into Centre of National History Education Youyou Villa
(Board Paper AAB/27/2023-24)**

45. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the Centre of National History Education (Hong Kong) ("CNHE") and its project and heritage

consultants (the “Homi Villa Project Team”) to the meeting to present the HIA of the proposed works to convert Homi Villa, a Grade 3 historic building, into “Centre of National History Education Youyou Villa (“Youyou Villa””, a learning centre with integration of Chinese culture and history and environmental studies aiming to deepen public understanding of the environment, history and culture and allow visitors to learn about the history of Hong Kong through exhibitions, guided tours, lectures and workshops (the “Homi Villa Project”), adding that the Homi Villa Project was one of the projects under Batch VI of the Revitalisation Scheme under DEVB:

- (i) Prof TING Sun-pao
School Supervisor, CNHE
- (ii) Dr YAU Kwok-kwong
Director of Administration, CNHE
- (iii) Mr Vincent LAI
Director, ARCA Limited
- (iv) Mr Elzaphan LIU
Assistant Architectural Conservationist, Substance Lab Limited

46. Before discussion, Prof Phyllis LI declared that Mr Elzaphan LIU, one of the authors of the HIA report of the Homi Villa Project, was her previous student of the Urban Planning Course offered by her at The University of Hong Kong. The Chairman noted Prof LI’s declaration and advised her to continue to join the discussion.

47. The Chairman thanked the Homi Villa Project Team for the hospitality during the site visit to Homi Villa by the Board on 1 March 2024.

48. Dr YAU Kwok-kwong shared with Members the objectives of the Homi Villa Project. Mr Elzaphan LIU elaborated the historical, social and architectural values of Homi Villa. Mr Vincent LAI then explained the design proposal of the project and Mr Elzaphan LIU went on with the possible impacts on Homi Villa and the proposed mitigation measures. Lastly, Dr YAU Kwok-kwong illustrated the interpretation strategies of the project.

49. Miss Theresa YEUNG supported the Homi Villa Project as it could provide diversified educational elements and uncover the characteristics of Homi

Villa upon revitalisation, thus creating good experience for visitors. Besides, the flat roof of Homi Villa was a beautiful observatory deck associated with the history and culture of the surrounding areas which could also create a vivid educational experience. She commended the Homi Villa Project Team for the well-designed project proposal.

50. Having regard to Youyou Villa's proximity to the adjacent public car park, Prof CHU Hoi-shan suggested exploring the feasibility of making use of the car park especially during event days (e.g. running events) when the parking spaces would usually be heavily occupied. Furthermore, he said that Castle Peak Road (Ting Kau section) was popular for cycling and so the proposed restaurant at Youyou Villa could serve as a supply station where cyclists might stop by for drinks and photo-taking, making the learning centre one of the spots along the cycling route which could foster tourism in the New Territories.

51. Ms Alice YIP suggested devising a tour route of Youyou Villa and engaging tour groups to maximise the use of the proposed restaurant especially during weekdays for sustainable operation of the self-financing learning centre.

52. Mr Caspar YAM supported the Homi Villa Project, adding that its design proposal was commendable. He enquired about the rationale for the proposed restoration of Homi Villa's architectural features of the 1970s but not earlier. In response, Dr YAU Kwok-kwong said that the RUTTONJEE family (of which Mr Jehangir Hormusjee RUTTONJEE, a well-known Indian merchant in Hong Kong, was the original owner of Homi Villa) was imprisoned during the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and hence most of the features of Homi Villa of the earlier period had been destroyed. Mr Elzaphan LIU added that there was a lack of related evidences (e.g. photos) to clearly show the appearance of Homi Villa of the 1930s – 1960s in the course of study on the building. As such, on the basis of the conservation principle that restoration should be based on historical documentation, the proposed restoration could only rest on the earliest available drawings of Homi Villa dated back to the 1970s.

53. Dr Jane LEE supported the Homi Villa Project as the proposed restoration could reflect the characteristics of Homi Villa. Given that it would be challenging to operate catering as the core business of Youyou Villa in the area, she enquired about the future operation plan for running the business. Also, she asked how the relationship between this western architecture and national history could be built for strengthening Hong Kong's cultural fusion of East and West.

54. Prof TING Sun-pao responded that notwithstanding the western architecture of Homi Villa, its location on a promontory could tell rich history of the ancient and modern times, such as the historic events of the Southern Song period of the Song dynasty and the Battle of Tunmen.

55. With regard to the public car park, Dr YAU Kwok-kwong said that the Homi Villa Project Team would try to liaise with the Government to explore the feasibility of making use of it. Concerning the sustainability of Youyou Villa, apart from catering business, the centre would also organise fee-charging guided tours to Sham Tseng and the vicinity targeting at tour groups to promote culture and education with a view to subsidising its operation cost.

56. Mr HO Kui-yip enquired whether the external façades and balustrades of Homi Villa would be restored to the original stucco finishes.

57. Prof Phyllis LI suggested blending in the national history, Hong Kong history, the local history of the Tsuen Wan and Sham Tseng areas and the history of the RUTTONJEE family in the Homi Villa Project systematically and coherently for better heritage interpretation.

58. For financial sustainability sake, Ms Salome SEE suggested having a coffee shop at Youyou Villa so as to attract young people or cyclists to stop by. Also, concession counters might be set up at the centre to sell a variety of products (e.g. cakes and souvenirs) with a view to boosting revenue of Youyou Villa.

59. Mr Edward YUEN commented that it would be better if the design proposal of the Homi Villa Project could emphasise more about Mr Jehangir Hormusjee RUTTONJEE's contributions to Hong Kong so as to attract people to Youyou Villa. Moreover, the location of Homi Villa was unique as it witnessed the industrial development of the New Territories as well as the transformation of West Kowloon and Lantau Island. In addition, given the impressive vista of the open space outside Homi Villa, he suggested exploring the feasibility to make good use of it (e.g. setting up a coffee shop thereat) to allow visitors to stay longer at Youyou Villa.

60. Regarding the heritage interpretation strategies of the Homi Villa Project, Prof TING Sun-pao explained that the history of the RUTTONJEE family would be the main focus of heritage interpretation inside Youyou Villa, covering the family's settlement in Bombay and trading in Canton as well as the setting up of the Hong Kong Brewers and Distillers Limited in Sham Tseng. Besides, the

industrial development in and the setting of Sham Tseng would also be introduced in which the Chiu Chow and Hakka clans would be included. Hence, the heritage interpretation would run through national hometowns, Hong Kong and overseas which would be interesting.

61. As for the finishes of the external façades and balustrades of Homi Villa, Mr Elzaphan LIU replied that a paint analysis conducted in early 2024 revealed that the colours on the finishes were not the original ones with other colours applied underneath. The exact colours and materials to be used for restoration of the finishes would depend on further study after removing the paint upon the commencement of the proposed works of the Homi Villa Project.

62. Dr YAU Kwok-kwong responded that Members' suggestion on the coffee shop would be taken into consideration in the Homi Villa Project. Although the use of the open space outside Homi Villa would be subject to some regulatory restrictions, the Homi Villa Project Team was developing an augmented reality game application to bring Chinese history textbooks to life with a view to creating an interactive learning experience thereat.

63. The Chairman thanked Members for their comments and asked the Homi Villa Project Team to take Members' comments into account. With no further views from Members, the Chairman concluded that the Board endorsed the HIA report of the Homi Villa Project and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board regarding the Homi Villa Project was not required.

Item 6 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/28/2023-24)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading Endorsed at the Last Meeting

64. ES(AM) recapped that the Board endorsed the proposed grading of the following four items at the meeting on 14 December 2023:

- (i) Hung Hom (Three Districts) Kaifong Association, No. 66 Gillies Avenue South, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N74);
- (ii) "Birds Bridge", Queen's Road West, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N1);

- (iii) Village house, No. 19 Muk Wu, Ta Kwu Ling, New Territories, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N91); and
- (iv) “The Nest”, No. 21 Ling Shan Road, Fanling, New Territories, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N204).

65. ES(AM) reported that a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the above four items was conducted from 25 January to 25 February 2024. No written submission had been received on the proposed grading status of all items.

66. Members had no comment and supported the confirmation of the proposed grading status for the four items listed in paragraph 64 above.

Review of Grading

Kwong Fook Tsz, No. 40 Tai Ping Shan Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. 1092)

67. Before discussion, Mr Albert SU declared that he was the Chief Executive of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (“TWGHs”), the organisation which owned and managed Kwong Fook Tsz (“KFT”). Miss Erica CHIM declared that the company she worked at was commissioned by AMO to conduct research on KFT, in which she personally participated in the research work in 2021-2022. The Chairman noted Mr SU’s and Miss CHIM’s declarations. He welcomed Mr SU to provide supplementary information on KFT when necessary but abstain from discussion and voting, whereas Miss CHIM to continue to join the discussion.

68. C(HB)2 reported that KFT was accorded Grade 2 by the Board in 2010. TWGHs, the owner of KFT, had submitted a written request with supplementary information on KFT to AMO earlier, appealing for a review of the grading of the KFT as they considered that the current grading status could not fully reflect the heritage value of the temple. After scrutinising the supplementary information provided by TWGHs, AMO considered the information reliable and had not been taken into account when the temple was graded. Thus, AMO had carried out further research on the temple in accordance with the established grading mechanism. After inspecting KFT and reviewing its heritage value by the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”), the Assessment Panel recommended adjusting the grading of the temple from Grade 2 to proposed Grade 1.

69. C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value, the current condition and the proposed grading of KFT.

70. The Chairman took the opportunity to thank TWGHs for accommodating the Board's site visit to KFT on 1 March 2024 and recommending a grading review for the temple, as well as their contributions and also the conservation work in the Sheung Wan area for over 100 years.

71. Mr Ivan FU suggested refurbishing the elevated platform of KFT and improving the environment to enhance the overall appearance of KFT, adding that he noticed on the photo that a rubbish bin had been placed right outside the temple.

72. Prof Phyllis LI and Dr Jane LEE supported upgrading KFT to proposed Grade 1. Considering that the temple was situated on an elevated platform and thus easily unnoticed by passersby, Prof Phyllis LI suggested that interpretation on its historical significance be provided on the retaining wall of the elevated platform at street level.

73. Ms Salome SEE supported upgrading KFT to proposed Grade 1 from the holistic perspective, taking into account the hardware and software of the temple as well as the philanthropic spirit of TWGHs. She was amazed by the three-hall-one-bay layout of the temple.

74. Mr HO Kui-yip enquired if the retaining wall of the elevated platform of KFT could be used for displaying photos of the three-hall-one-bay layout of the temple so that passersby could understand the building's interior even if they did not go upstairs to the temple.

75. Prof LAM Weng-cheong also supported upgrading KFT to proposed Grade 1. He suggested sharing the photos of the temple taken by AMO with the public online. The Chairman shared Members' views that the three-hall-one-bay layout of the temple could hardly be seen by the public from street level, so it would be good to share the photos of the layout with the public on AMO's website.

76. Prof CHU Hoi-shan supported upgrading KFT to proposed Grade 1. Viewing that the adjacent Pound Lane Public Toilet and Bathhouse was a "Government, Institution and Community" facility, he suggested the operator of KFT to explore ways on improving the accessibility to the temple for persons with disabilities by tapping on the nearby facility.

77. With no further views from Members, the Board endorsed the grading of KFT as proposed Grade 1.

78. After endorsement of the proposed grading of KFT, Mr Albert SU wished to share with Members some supplementary information on the temple in relation to Members' comments above. Regarding the rubbish bin, cleaning workers might sometimes place it outside the temple during peak hours to facilitate visitors' rubbish dumping thereat. As for the retaining wall of the elevated platform, KFT had exchanged views with the local residents when the temple carried out renovation works previously and it was understood from them that they preferred keeping the retaining wall in red, following the colour it had been adopting since the 1990s. He also shared with Members that mural painting had once been displayed on the retaining wall before. However, he pointed out that there were in fact limitations on the use of the retaining wall as it was connected to the drainage system. Nonetheless, he would explore with the temple on the ways to beautify the retaining wall as far as practicable while not disturbing its red tone and its drainage function. The Chairman thanked Mr SU for his supplementary information provided.

New Items for Grading Assessment

79. The Chairman said that the following two items would be discussed at the meeting:

- (i) Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N365); and
- (ii) Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N366).

80. C(HB)3 briefed Members on the heritage value, the current conditions and the proposed grading or no grading of the above two items respectively.

Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N365)

81. In response to Dr Jane LEE's enquiry on the current use of the building of Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road and the owners' reaction to the proposed grading, C(HB)3 replied that the building currently housed two shops on the ground floor and two residential floors above. AMO had conducted a site

inspection to the building earlier but was not able to reach the respective owners of the buildings.

82. Mr HO Kui-yip said that Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road was a typical old tenement building, and enquired if there were similar type of buildings also surviving in the Sham Shui Po district. In response, C(HB)3 said that Nos. 117, 119, 121, 123 and 125 Nam Cheong Street (Grade 3), No. 75 Un Chau Street (Grade 3), No. 62 Fuk Wing Street (Grade 3) and No. 170 Yee Kuk Street (Grade 2) were some of the examples of pre-war shophouses in the district.

83. In response to Prof CHU Hoi-shan's enquiry on the suspected unauthorized building works on the building of Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road, ES(AM) replied that grading assessment only focused on the heritage value of the building concerned, making reference to its original building plans.

84. With no further views from Members, the Board endorsed the grading of Nos. 386 and 388 Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po as proposed Grade 3.

Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N366)

85. Mr Caspar YAM said that the building of Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street was a pre-war concrete tenement building despite the fact that it had undergone substantial alterations. It represented the typology and building technology in around 1930 as the use of concrete in building construction had only become popular from the 1930s onwards. He understood that there were less than ten pre-war tenement buildings with cantilevered balconies currently existing in Hong Kong among which the building of Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street was the only one in Mong Kok. Furthermore, this tenement building, in which schools once operated, was associated with historical stories and figures compared with other buildings of similar type. He suggested linking up the building of Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street with other pre-war tenement buildings (e.g. No. 23 Argyle Street (No Grading) and Nos. 282, 287 and 297 Portland Street in Mong Kok) that were within walking distance in the area in response to the concept of "city walk".

86. The Chairman said that a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street, among other items with proposed grading discussed at this meeting, would be conducted upon endorsement of its proposed grading. Member's comments above, in particular the number of existing pre-war buildings with cantilevered balconies in Hong Kong, together

with the public views received from the public consultation, if any, would be conveyed to and further reviewed by the Assessment Panel before confirming the proposed grading of the building at the next meeting.

87. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the proposed no grading status for Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street. He commented that the front and side elevations of the building lacked the then architectural style of the old days, thus diminishing its historical ambience for appreciation. He considered that the characteristics of the building could rather be preserved by means of record.

88. With no further views from Members, the Board endorsed the proposed no grading for Nos. 53 and 55 Shantung Street, Mong Kok.

Item 7 Any Other Business

89. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m..

Antiquities and Monuments Office

June 2024

Ref: AMO/22-3/1